

Opinion 2382 (Case 3637) – Conservation of the accustomed usage of *Papilio phoebus* De Prunner, 1798 by suppression of *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793 not approved (Insecta, Lepidoptera, PAPILIONIDAE)

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

c/o Lee Kong Chian Natural History Museum, 2 Conservatory Drive, Singapore 117377, Republic of Singapore (e-mail: iczn@nus.edu.sg)

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:00350B72-654C-40F9-8DF7-EA40E4185FF5>

Abstract. The Commission has not used its plenary power to conserve the name *Papilio phoebus* De Prunner, 1798 for the European ‘Small Apollo’ butterfly (PAPILIONIDAE) found in the Holarctic by giving it precedence over the senior primary homonym *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; PAPILIONIDAE; PARNASSIINAE; *Parnassius*; *P. phoebus*; *P. ariadne*; *P. corybas*; European ‘Small Apollo’ butterfly; Holarctic.

Ruling

- (1) The Commission has declined to use its plenary power to suppress the species name *phoebus* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Papilio phoebus*, for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;
- (2) The species name *phoebus* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Papilio phoebus*, has priority over *Doritis ariadne* Lederer, 1853 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms;
- (3) The species name *phoebus* De Prunner, 1798, as published in the binomen *Papilio phoebus*, is a permanently invalid junior primary homonym of *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793;
- (4) No names have been placed on the Official Lists or Indexes in this ruling.

History of Case 3637

An application to conserve the specific name of the European ‘Small Apollo’ butterfly, *Papilio phoebus* De Prunner, 1798 was received from Emilio Balletto and Simona Bonelli (both from the *Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, Via Accademia Albertina 13 – I-10123 Torino, Italy*). After correspondence the Case was published in BZN 71(2): 75–80 on 30 June 2014 (Balletto & Bonelli, 2014). The title, abstract and keywords of the Case were published on the Commission’s website. No comments on the Case were received.

The Case was sent for vote on 1 December 2015 (VP 24). Less than half of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (10 For, 12 Against, 2 Abstain).

Decision of the Commission

At the close of the voting period on 1 March 2016 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 10: Balletto, Bouchard, Bourgoïn, Evenhuis, Grygier, Harvey, Krell, Rosenberg, Winston and Zhang.

Negative votes – 12: Aescht, Alonso-Zarazaga, Bogutskaya, Dmitriev, Halliday, Kojima, Kottelat, Kullander, Lamas, Pape, Rheindt and Yanega.

Abstain – 2: Welter-Schultes and Zhou.

Ng, Pyle and van Tol were on leave of absence.

Voting FOR, Krell stated that the transfer of a binomen from one species to another one is amongst the most disruptive and confusing actions in nomenclature. The affirmative vote in this case was to ensure that *Parnassius phoebus* (De Prunner, 1798) can continue to be used for the species it has long been used for. Also voting FOR, Rosenberg stated that the application was incorrect in stating that new combinations will result from the requested action; a new association of specific and subspecific names is not a new combination. Furthermore, the lack of any discussion on the type material of De Prunner's taxon was a concern.

Voting AGAINST, Alonso-Zarazaga stated that the request implied not only a change of authorship and date, but also of the nominal species concept, and in a group of taxa whose taxonomy is not yet settled (judging from the variable amount of subspecies mentioned and from the use of some of these as species as well). Taking into consideration that the species were now correctly identified, the names should be applied according to their true identities. Also voting AGAINST, Dmitriev commented that the authors proposed the rejection the name of *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793 in favour of *P. phoebus* De Prunner, 1798 in order to preserve the name of the European species, which was erroneously identified as *P. phoebus*. It would appear that the rejection will conserve the name for the European species, only with a different authorship. Technically speaking, two different names are being discussed. Even if the name were to stay the same, it is a different nomenclatural concept (associated with a different author and different nomenclatural act validating this name). The authors mentioned that this will preserve the associations between the subspecific and specific names associated with *P. phoebus*. The fact is the issue would not be resolved. The subspecies were described in association with the species name described by Fabricius, not by De Prunner. New associations will still be needed in order to make an association with a different nomenclatural species name which has exactly the same spelling. Also, European and Asian subspecies probably have associations with different specific names (either Fabricius or De Prunner). Changing the name to the correct identifications (i.e., *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793 for the Asian species and *P. corybas* for European species) will definitely resolve the ambiguity. Each subspecies will be unambiguously associated with one species or the other. Also voting AGAINST, Halliday stated that it would be premature to take nomenclatural action while the taxonomy of these species and subspecies of *Papilio* is not resolved. Also voting AGAINST, Kojima commented that the two names, *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793, and *Papilio phoebus* De Prunner, 1798, are homonymous but are not synonymous. Approval of this proposal may possibly bring more serious nomenclatural confusion. The best solution of this case would be that, following the Code, *Parnassius phoebus* (Fabricius, 1793) is applied to the Altai species, *Papilio phoebus* De Prunner, 1798 is a homonym of *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793 and thus is unavailable, and *Parnassius corybas* Fischer de Waldheim, 1823 is applied to the widespread species.

References

- Balletto, E. & Bonelli, S. 2014. Case 3637. *Papilio phoebus* De Prunner, 1798: proposed conservation in its accustomed usage by suppression of *Papilio phoebus* Fabricius, 1793 (Insecta, Lepidoptera, Papilionidae). *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, **71**(2): 75–80.